

(10)
A
SUDDAIN
ESSAY,



With a sincere desire to vindicate Christi-
anity, or the Common Faith :

From the superlative Heresies, or phantastical Novelties,
of all selte-particular Sciolists, endeavouring the subver-
sion of the same : by seven Arguments used in Oppositi-
on to Mr. John Biddle, Febr. 18. and Febr. 25. 1654. at
his School in Coleman-street.

By Richard Jackson, Master of the Free Grammar School
in Sedbergh, and Preacher of the Gospel in Garisdale.



4.

100
499 3
241

L O N D O N,

Printed by THO. HARPER, 1655.

1655

720 21

To his Highnesse the Lord Protector of England,
Scotland, and Ireland. *C*

Sir,



His bold addresse is made, not to move for any secular aide or armed assistance, either to maintaine the Arguments, or mall the adversary. The Catholick faith, (once delivered to the Saints) is a truth which humane authority seldome understandeth, nor ever ought to change or alter. Magistrates, in my conceit, may doe well to countenance what they conceive to be right and Canonickall, so they doe not for the interest of their own sense, by secular compulsion, suppress all different Opinionists, walking orderly in reference to the worlds polity. When Kings or Parliaments act otherwise, I am in great fear, tis more for their own ends, then advance of the faith, which as all other Religions may bee retained as an instrument of tyranny, (so one of the Turks hath acknowledged) not as a saving truth. And therefore I could not think, but that the late Parliament incurred some reproach, in so casting this learned Opinionist into Prison, contrary to the notorious example of some Calvinisticall Magistrates in Geneva, meddling with a more superlative Heretike, Servius the Spaniard, and quite against the moderation of such able men, as was that pious Bishop of Marseilles [Salvianus.] So giving scandalous advantage to our clamorous Adversaries, who conclude an absolute necessity of secular compulsion, subordinate to Ecclesiasticall power, without the which, sects will abound, and baffle the ablest of Bishoply Doctors; saying also, it is irrational to think, that these Arrian questions, can be definitively resolved, by a criticall libration of dead and uncertaine words, as if in these mysteries, the spirit were not Gramatically plaine. Therefore deeming this opinion better corresponding with the prophane and ignorant, then with the pious and able in Scripture understanding; in the first place I humbly Petition your Highnesse that mine Adversary may be free to write what he pleaseth, in answer to the Arguments, or for his own

Assertion; for upon pretended feares they have refused the proffered way of giving and receiving just satisfaction, and in this faire way if I cannot wrap him up in such apparent obstinacy against the evidence of the word, as the indifferent must acknowledge, I will then openly confesse mine ignorance and presumption, knowing full well that in my despaylance, Christ hath many others, with spirituall weapons sufficiently armed for the worke, unto which they are called and excited by reason of the combate and opposition of the contrary minded, which is an eminent effect of a fatherly providence so provoking truly pious soules to awake from that lethall security wherein long tranquillity had plunged them: so that if wee counterpoise the good accruing by these means rousing of their zeale and forces, with the losse sustained by others stragling out of the way, the profit will at length surmount the prejudice by plain and Apodeicticall Arguments against all hereticall novelists, Phanaticke opinionists, and Atheisticall Epochists, abounding heerabouts, who have Apostatized from the primeest reputation of strictest profession into the horrible darkenesse of irreligion, making that very thing an unanswerable argument for liberty; from the which, Papists, and some of our Protestant Grandees with a selfe confounding sottishness, do obstinately assert compulsive authority: for this point thoroughly sifted will induce by degrees an orderly discussion of all these articles, wherein he differeth from the unanimous consent of those who are called Orthodox, and by a cleare reflexion serve to refell those hyperephanian fancies which obey pride as a father; for bee is not to bee found, I feare, amongst the phanaticke or new fangled, who had not rather bee leader of some stragling troupe though in the path of perdition, then an humble Disciple in the schoole of truth, evinced by Scripture evidence. But this and the rest are humbly referred to your Highnes further examination, in a reverend regard to your gracious equanimity & great ability to distinguish the chiefest Argument of a prime magistrate, really apprehensiv, imperare liberis, which very thing to the Princes of this world seemeth impossible.

Your Highnesses humble servant in the truth, Jackson.

*Argument 1. from Añ. 20. 26. 27. and cap. 26. 22.
with Rom. 16. 26.*

IF the Apostle Paul were obliged to declare the whole counsell of God from the Scriptures Propheticall, and that hee did declare according to his obligation, then the Apostle Paul did declare & preach the blood of Christ (which is the blood of the New Testament powred out) to be a proper sacrifice for sin.

Assumpt. But the Antecedent is evident from the places alleadged, *Ergo*, the Consequent is infallible, viz that Paul the Doctor of the Gentiles did so declare and preach. The Consequence of the Proposition (which Mr. Biddle denied) is proved thus.

If one of the Prophets have expressly asserted his soule a sacrifice for sin (which is a terme in the Old Testament, and in the Mosaicall Phrasiology, unto which Isaiah referreth himselfe and all others, *chap. 8. 20.*) equipollent to that of blood, then the Consequence is undeniable.

Assumpt. But one of the Prophets hath expressly so asserted, *Isa. cap. 53. 10.* *Ergo*, the Consequence is undeniable, the Consequence is unquestioned, &c. The Assumption was proved thus, *Deut. 12. 23.* Take heed that thou eat not the blood, for the blood is the soule, as it was then evidenced by the expresse words both of the Hebrew Originall, and the Greeke Septuagint or Translation. Again, by *Levit. 17. 11. 14.* where the Greek and Hebrew Texts were both alleadged again as speaking expressly, that the soule of all flesh is in the blood &c. And (saith the Lord) I have given you the blood upon the Altar to make an expiation

piation of your soules, for the blood is that which maketh an expiation for the soule, which Mr. *Jackson* then compared with that in Heb. 2. 14. 17. observing unto us (by the way) that the son of God participated of our flesh and blood, that hee might bee a mercifull and faithfull High Priest to propitiate for the finnes of the people, and therefore that he was an high Priest, before he came in heaven, according to our nature assumed, and his blood so assumed which was his life, (as touching the flesh 1. Pet. 4. 1.) the most proper part by which he did sacrifice himselfe, or suffer for us to purge our sins.

To this Mr. *Biddle* had nothing then to reply, but capriciously sought evasion from the double signification of the Hebrew word *Asham*, asserting that it signified sin; which Mr. *Jackson* acknowledged, but averring withall, that heere it must signifie a sacrifice for sin, without which there was no sence. Mr. *Biddle* therefore alleadged that in 2. Cor. 5. 21. which hee boasted to clear: but so they brangled rather then disputed out the time. But presently after Mr. *Jackson* told us, that to cleare that Text from all or any such sophisticall evasion, it was needfull to consider the Idiom of the Hebrew expression; and secondly to weigh those two words Levit. 7. *Asham* and *Chattab*, which are in the Lexicons promiscuously used, in the very same acceptions, though there seemeth to be a difference in the degree of Guilt, and in this difference the aggravation lieth upon *Asham*, Levit. 7.

Then to clear this by Apodeicticall Argument. If these two words *Asham* and *Chattab* doe commonly according to the Idiosime of the Hebrew, signifie and designe, some Calf, Bullock, or such like creature, as a sacrifice for sin, and that Mr. *Biddle*s evasive Allegation, be fortisly wicked,

led, and against the expresse word; then the Text in *Isai.* 53. 10. is full & clear enough to prove the bloud of Christ a proper sacrifice for sin.

Assumpt. But these two words *Sec.* doe commonly according to the Idiotisme of the Hebrew (and the phrase of the Spirit's expression) signifie a sacrifice for sin, and designe some Calfe, or the like, for the same purpose, as may clearly appear by *Levit.* 7. 1.

This is the Law (*Hachbam*) not of sin, but of the sacrifice for sin, or of the trespass offering *Sec.* with *Exod.* 29. 36. Thou shalt make the Calfe (*Chatab*) not sin, which were absurd, but an offering for sin, *Sec.* with *Levit.* 16. 6. and 11. verses. And *Aaron* shall bring, or make to bee brought, (not the Calfe sin) but as the Septuagint renders it, the Calfe the sacrifice for sin, *Sec.* So also in verse 11. and severall other places, but these may suffice, to shew the vanity of Mr. *Biddles* evasion: and wishall that *S. Paul's* phrase 2. *Cor.* 5. 21. (which Mr. *Biddle* catched at to countenance his captious escape) is a meer Idiotisme of the Hebrew tongue. He hath made him sin, that is to say, a sacrifice for sin, by laying all our iniquities upon him, *Isai.* 53. 6. without the which he could never become a sacrifice for sin, nor be made a curse, as it is said *Gal.* 3. 13. and was intimated by Mr. *Jackson*, who to avoyd the prolixity of a criticall contention, in this or any other of like nature, will refer himselfe to any learned Theologure, (or because they cannot endure the name of Divines) to any able man in these originall languages.

Secondly, that Mr. *Biddles* evasive Allegation, is fortisshly wicked, and against the word, may appear: 1. for then eyther the essence of the soul must be made sin, quite con-

trary to all Philosophy or Divinity, (which alwayes asser-
teth sin to be an Ataxie or privation) except we should re-
vive the monstrous phantasie of the Manichees, or the scan-
dalous imagination of *Mabius Iliricus*, so much scolt as
by *Cardinall Bellarmine*.

Or secondly made the soule sin, *i. e.* finfull, as one of Mr.
Biddles Profelites, with a Legall or Law driving Gravity,
hath averred, *viz.* that Christ died for his owne sinnes;
which is against the expresse Text of Heb. 7. 26. 1. Per. 2. 22.
And this very place in 2. Cor. 5. 21. *ton me gnosta amartian*,
that hath not known sin; that is to say, hath not sinned,
or hath no experience of sin. For so Christ is sayd to learn
in matter of sufferings; and we also to know when to try
by experience what we had by speculation.

Esce, that text in *Isaiah* 53. 10. is clear enough to prove
the blood of Christ a proper sacrifice from what hath been
sayd in *Levit.* and *Deuter.* to evidence that the expresse
of the spirit in *Isai* 53. 10. doeth intend the life and so the
blood, by the terme of soule. I will but only adde our Sa-
viours own language in *John* 10. 17. 18. The Father loveth
me because I lay down my life, or my soule, (as it is in the
Originall) or my blood, according to the Mosaicall Idio-
tisme, the law and rule of Propheticall speech, *Isai* 8. 20.
which was the blood of the new Testament powred out,
a proper sacrifice, offered by the command of his father,
who made him an high Priest, as shall bee proved abun-
dantly.

Argument 2. From Heb. 9. 23.

IF the opening of the entrance into Heaven Heb. 9, 11, 12, the consecrating of the same, Hebr. 10, 19, 20, and the purging of those who enter, Heb. 9, 14, bee by the blood of Christ, or Christs owne blood, then the blood of Christ, or Christs owne blood, must needs bee one of those better sacrifices, Heb. 9, 23, (or that better sacrifice) (answering and exceeding those of the Law) whereby the blot of sin is purged, and the wrath of God is pacified.

Assumpt. But all these were by the blood of Christ, or by Christs owne blood; as appeareth plainly from the very letter, *Erge*, the blood of Christ must needs be one of those better sacrifices, or that better sacrifice.

The connexion or consequence of the proposition is infallible, by the whole coherence of the Apostles discourse in that Chapter. So that no wrested interpretation can beare water against the cleare and unforced evidence of the word. What Mr. Biddle hath said, is very obscure and uncertaine, what hee can say to intangle the evidence of this argument let him briefly discover, so as we may examine the truth of his conception, and we shall either fairly accept, or fully refell it. But let every sound Christian diligently observe, how the spirit of Christ in that part endeavoureth an exact parallell betwene the typical of the Old, and the true blood of the New Testament even to the word of sprinkling Heb. 9, 20, 21, with cap. 10, 22: and to that purpose speaketh of purging heavenly things, o make the blood of Christ answerable to that of Bulls & Goats, which purged (also) the holy of holies. Into

which though the people never entred, yet thither (it seemeth) their uncleanness extended, Levit. 16, 14, 16, 17.

Even so as if the impurity of our nature, and its operations, had so penetrated the Heavens, & made them unclean as it is phrased (Job, 15, 15,) that they also may be purged, together with the true anitype of the Ministers all vessels. But the Argument is cleare without examining what, & it doth intend: which is not the question now, (except one would cavill. And then hee may consider Ephes. 2. 6. with Coloss. 1. 20. And so conceive aright without a Corrector) no more then what is meant by the eternall spirit, cap. 9, 14, which in due place, shall be declared, to designe something Antecedent to the pouring forth of that blood of the New Testament, Mar. 26, 28, and to intend the very deiry of Christ which is eternall, and did so offer his owne blood Act. 20, 28, But let him avoid such digressions & deale only with the Argument, as it standeth directed unto him.

Argument 3. Ex Hebr. 9, 26, with Heb. 7, 27, 1 Cor.

3, 7, Ephes. 5.

IF Christ could not be a slain sacrifice, as the word signifieth, but by the wounding of his body, and pouring out of his blood; then the blood of Christ so poured out is much more properly styled a sacrifice.

The reason is, 1. *Ex Hebr. 9, 26, with Heb. 7, 27, 1 Cor.*

Assumpt. But Christ could not be (as the word signifieth) a slain sacrifice, but by the wounding of his body, and pouring out of his blood.

Ergo, the blood of Christ so poured out is much more properly styled a sacrifice.

I never had *seru'd* his writings, nor any time to read Mr. *Bidd's* Books, having my spirit oppressed, and memory burdened with importunate businesse of far baser nature, and therefore according to *Aristotle* more Natural to all intellectuall abilities; such pestiloggng Mammonists, as pride themselves and fatten their insulting envy if they can captive poore suiters and intangle Scholars in the wofull Labyrinth of Law practise, are spitefull enemies of the publike good, no lesse then of truth and piety. Hence it is, that I cannot certainly say, how farre this Argument reacheth him; for his Answer was neither directly nor distinctly returned, but he seemed to me by shuffling so to overshadow the Text, as if Christ were not a sacrifice in being wounded upon the Crosse, and slain heer on earth, but only by his personall appearance in heaven, where he ever liveth to make See. Heb. 7, 25. Therefore that this Argument may clearly reach him, and conclude absolutely against him, I shall frame another Syllogisme from Eph. 5, 2, Heb. 9, 26, cap. 7. 27, with 1 Cor. 5, 7.

That which is expressed in the preterperfect tense as a thing done on earth, in the sight and for the example and imitation of all true Christians, (in one kind of way) and which could not be effected but by sufferance, which was but once, nor could nor needed to bee reiterated, that can never be interpreted truly, of his personall appearance in heaven, to make intercession for us, but must needs intend some proper sacrifice of himselfe heer upon the earth.

Assump. But that Christ should be a staine or bloody sacrifice unto death, (as Divine Justice required for due satisfaction, and the word signifieth) 1 Cor. 5, 7 is expressed in the preterperfect tense, as a thing done in the sight of men.

men, and for their example and imitation, in a kind, Eph. 5. 2, which could not be but by suffeſſance, and was but once, nor could or needed so be reiterated, Heb. 9, 25, 26, Heb. 7, 26, as the very letter of these Texts doth clearly intimate. *Exgr*, that Christ should be such a flaine Sacrifice, or bloody unto death &c. can never be interpreted of his personall appearance in heaven, by the act of intercession, but must needs intend some sacrifice here on earth, which is that of the nature assumed, both of body and blood especially, so often inculcated.

The Proposition is undeniable from the Law of Dissentances, or rather Disparates; for of Christs intercession in heaven, how can it be sayd, (hee hath given himselfe for us, as a flaine sacrifice) which the word *thusia* there signifieth, being derived of *thuo* to kill; as in Hebrew *Zebach* a flaine sacrifice of *Zabach* (*Mabaz*, to kill) which none will contradict, nor disposed to cavill. Secondly, how can that giving or presenting of himselfe, be presented to us for example, seeing in that action hee never fell under humane sight or observation? Thirdly, in that sense it may be said, he will give himselfe for us, again and againe, so often as we stand in need of the spirit, and of speciall application in times of perillous tentation, but cannot as a flaine sacrifice; for that death can have no more dominion over him, nor he any more to suffer in the flesh, Rom. 6, 9, with 1 Pet. 4, 1.

For the *Assumption*, (called the *missa*) it is evident in every part of it, from the expresse words of the Texts, recalling but to mind the true signification of *thusia*, a flaine sacrifice, which may bee cleared from Matthew 22, 4. 1 Cor. 5, 7. Mine oxen and my sadings *noth*, slaughtered,



red &c. What in Scripture were called Sacrifices, especially expiatory, were to be destroyed, If living creatures, by slaughter (as other things by combustion, and some by effusion) and the bodies of those offered for sin, to be burned without the Camp, which is the reason why some one in *Euseb.* called it *holocaustum*, a fume, or exhalation, which ascenderth from the burning; when God by inspiration did order *Abel* and others successively to officiate by expiatory sacrifice, he intended but to shadow out the supreme sacrifice of all to be expected, *Dia.* And therefore not only the use of the thing was to be offered unto God, but also the very life and substance of it, which occasioneth this word and phrase, *Ephes. 5.* in correspondence to the types. And because I would have Arguments to exceed in weight rather then number, *Mr. Biddle* may for further illustration take notice, that the Apostle in *Heb. 8. 3.* plainly gathereth and concludeth, that hee could not have been an high Priest, except he had that sacrifice which he could offer, viz our humane nature both of body and blood *Vid. Gen 22 7.*

That Divine Justice required such a sacrifice, for due satisfaction, may be easily made manifest afterwards, and illustrated also from the eminent instance of *Zaleucus*.

This third Argument is coincident with that which I used upon our former day of Debate, *Febr. 18. 1654.* viz. whatsoever agreeth to the whole principally in respect of any essentiall part, is more properly predicated of that essentiall part, then it is of the whole. *ex. bonum de bonum*
Assumpt. But to be a proper sacrifice expiatory, agreeth to the person of Christ, *1. Cor. 5.* and by reason of the humane nature assumed, viz the body *Heb. 10. 10.* and the blood *Heb. 9. 14.*

blood especially, Heb. 9, 22; with Math. 26, 27, 28.

Erge, the blood on the body is more properly stiled a sacrifice.

This Argument thus urged, intangled us in a tedious and disorderly contest before the non-intelligent; Mr. Biddle denying the Proposition, and giving an instance against it, which seemed too prolix and insufficient, so that at length by a comparison I brought him off it, to the acknowledgement of Theologicall axiome, viz. that if any one should call him or me Gowry fellow, in reference to a Gowry legge, then Gowtine fitt were more properly predicated of that integrall part, than of the whole, &c. So likewise for the other alleadged, viz. that whosoever denominateth any thing so, or so, is much more properly such then that which it so denominates. If Apollos for his tongue be entialed an eloquent man, then his tongue is much more properly so intimated. I hope Mr. Biddle will not balk the best sense of what is alleadged.

Argument 4.

Being the slight esteem Mr. Biddle had of Divines, I durst not alleadge that axiomaticall Assertion, of the most Diaconicall Doctor, amongst all those Latine lights, who from the Church have shined unto the world in life and Doctrine, however casually by increasing snuffes obscured, viz. that the passion and death of Christ, is a most true and perfect sacrifice. Which Mr. Biddle seemeth (for as yet I have found no clearnesse, or constancy in his assertions) to make (together with the blood powred out) but onely as certaine previous actions to that sacrifice

or oblation (without any distinction of those words used by him, in my hearing) which was not made upon the Crosse when hee lost his owne life; But onely by his presentation in Heaven where hee liveth for ever. To which purpose (as I remember) he used an illustrating assertion, viz. that the bringing and killing of the beast, the powring out of the blood, and the burning of the body, were not the sacrifice, but the taking of the blood of the Goat, or Bullock, &c so making an atonement by carrying it into the Holiest of all &c. Therefore some things heere, had need be interposed, not to increase the number, or trouble the renour of our Discourse used in our Discrib, but onely to clear the candle of whatsoever obscureth, or may emangle the inexpert in the word of righteousness, Heb. 5. 13.

We must proceed to a fourth Argument against that pretence of some previous actions; as distinct from, and therefore not formally proper to the sacrificing.

If the presenting of the Beast before the Tabernacle, made it a sacrifice, the killing and powring out of the blood were the proper sacrificing of that beast; and then that the taking of the blood, and the sprinkling of it about the Altar of Incense in the holy place, were only a typical circumstance, to shew the efficacy of that blood formerly sacrificed &c. and so to shadow out, Heb. 10. 1. the vertue and efficacy of Christs blood once offered, by which he purged, (as it is asserted already) and now ever liveth to intercede for us, so to obtaine, for our consolation, the Holy Ghost, in our greatest calamities of conscience. Then the denying of Christ to bee a proper sacrifice by assuming our nature, and presenting himselfe in the same heere upon the crosse, Heb. 10. 6, 7, 9, 10 and especially by powring out his blood

bloud upon the Crosse, Heb. 10, 10, as if yet hee were no sacrifice for all that (nor any purgative efficacy in his bloud so offered) but only by the offering and presentation of his person in heaven, is a most abominable slighting of the bloud of God, Act 20, 28, and brain-sick error, as shal be evidenced.

Assumpt. But the former part of the Antecedent is most evident from those Books of the Law, Exod. Levit. Numbers.

And the other clause or part of it, is apparently proved by what is already alleaded from Heb. 9.

Ergo, the Consequent is conclusive and infallible.

Truth like vertue cleareth its way as it goeth; so heere I hope. And to this purpose on Febr. 18. I insinuated (against his mysticall asseverations) from Heb. 9, 27, that there was a vast disparity between these two terms, *offer*, and *appear*, to offer, and to appeare; but it was not referred or observed, except by himselfe; though the Apostle in that Chapter, separateth the apparition from the oblation far enough, bringing in, and establishing the one, upon the by-passed efficacy of the other, (which is already evidenced;) and upon his appearing, utterly denying all further oblation. Observe but the Text; and you must needs see it, Heb. 9, 24, 25, not that hee should offer himselfe, &c. though some may easily see a difference between sacrifice and oblation; for that some things may be offered which are not sacrificed, yet are they promiscuously used in reference to the person of Christ, Eph. 5, 2, Heb. 10, 10, with cap. 9, 16. But neither the Holy Ghost, nor the Greeks, I trow, did ever use *εὐχαριστία*, i. e. an oblation, for *προσκύνησις*, i. e. an apparition. If they did, then produce an instance

instance from some Classick Author, for I suppose you able for such a purpose, if it be possible for any to find such a place.

Last y, to clear all this (upon which I have interposed between the Arguments) briefly: If Christs entring once by the sacrifice of himself, that is to say, of his own blood, Heb. 9, 11, 12, be holden forth by the Spirit, as in a certain Antitypicall opposition, onely proper in being opposed to the entrance of the High Priest, each yeere with others blood, Heb. 9, 25. 26. with v. 11, 12, then the Spirit never intended to teach us any comparative opposition between Christs oblation, and the high Priests entrance into the holiest of all; as if Christ could not offer or sacrifice himselfe till hee came in Heaven, the oblation consisting in Christs entrance, by which he became to be the high Priest of our profession; as Mr. Biddle seemeth of opinion, though that overthroweth the proportion and long coherence of the parallell so apt and Grammatically plain.

Argument 5. From Rev. 3, 6, 9, with John 1, 29, 1 Joh. 1, 7, 2 Joh. 1, 7, and 1 Pet. 1, 19, with Rom. 3, 25.

THAT which purgeth and redeemeth from sin both Positively and Negatively, and effectually reconcileth us unto God upon our faith or application, that must needs be offered as a true and proper sacrifice; to the same end and purpose.

Assumpt. But the blood of the Lambe; the Lord Jesus, purgeth and redeemeth from sin both Positively and Negatively, and effectually reconcileth us to God, upon our faith or application.

Ergo, The blood of the Lamb, the Lord Jesus, was offered as a proper sacrifice to the same end and purpose.

The Proposition or *major*, as they call it, is manifest from the third Book of Moses, declaring the end and institution of the sin or trespass-offerings, Leviticus, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, with verses 15, and 16. So also cap. 6, 6, 7, with cap. 9, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, and cap. 16, 6, 7, 8, 9, and verses 11, 12, 13, 14, so he shall not die. So in verse 16, 27, 18, 19. All which and divers other places make it evident that these were sacrifices instituted for such ends and purposes, because they did so purge and make atonement, that is to say, reconcile and redeem from death temporally, according to the tenour of that Covenant, under which the people then stood, though in comparison they were but carnall ordinances, extending only to the purifying of the flesh, Heb. 9, 1, 13.

The *assumption minor*, as he calls it, is clear from these places and passages, Rev. 7, 3, 9. Joh. 1, 29, 11 Joh. 1, 7, Hen. 9, 15. 1. Pet. 1, 18, 19. Rom. 3, 25, with Eph. 1, 7.

Ergo, The Conclusion is infallible and undeniable.

To the *Assumption* Mr. *Wright* sayd, that the blood of Christ had an influence upon the remission of sins, and towards reconciliation. But what is this influence think we? For what can he would sayd it is done to the expresse words of the text, this word is strange to the text, and serving only for some uncouth interpretation. Doth it imply any such formal necessity, as is the blood of Christ, Ro. 3, 25, unto which, (as it is the blood of God, Act. 20, 28, faith relatech with an infallible adherence, as the only prime foundation, the effect, of all our consolation here, and of all our future hopes hereafter, else it is but a vain term to avoid the evidence of the text. An influence, and is that all?

all; for ought I yet understand by that term, he might say, that Christs riding upon an Asse, hath or had an influence upon the Jewes, and our reconciliation; therefore let him explain, if he be not to seek, what we should conceive by it; for upon his clear explication, I shall willingly confesse mine own weaknes, if I doe not make his conceit in this very thing, appear so absurd and nonsensicall, to any impartiall man, that may bee found, that it subverteth the great mystery of our most holy faith; upon which, as I told them, dependeth all our consolation heer, and all hopes of salvation heerafter. Of the which mystery of Godlinesse, truly so styled, Mr. *Biddle* seemeth in this novell imagination, either grossly ignorant, or prophanely contemptuous.

Secondly, afterwards and *obiter*, as wee use to say, Mr. *Biddle* alleadged that of Numb. 19. concerning the red Cow, &c. concluding from thence, as I thought, that a thing may be purgative of sin, and yet no sacrifice. I did not then cause the place to be read or examined, for I did not remember the originall word what it would bear, nor did I deem it pertinently urged at that instant. But so soon as ever it came in my mind, the same night when I came at my lodging, I looked for it, and the first Bible I opened rendred it expressly, a sin offering; and so it is by the two last words of the Hebrew text, Num. 19, 9. yea all the circumstances doe there ver. 2, 3, 4, 5. so concur to constitute a formall sacrifice, that I hope Master *Biddle* in his serious thoughts will acknowledge it. And that therefore mine Argument is in that part of this Assertion irrefragable, *vz.* the blood of Christ therefore a proper sacrifice, because purgative, &c.

Now

Now lest he should avoid these two Arguments (as he seemed to indeavour) by making them only previous actions, to the offering and presenting of his person in heaven, this may be fairly, firmly, and briefly opposed from the words of the texts alleadged, *viz.* If the Scripture do imply the person of the Mediatour, as previous to those actions of sacrificing his own body and blood according to the clearest conceptions of the most Catholike Doctors in the Church of Christ, then these actions can never in common apprehension be conceived and taken as previous onely to the persons oblation or presentation of himselfe in heaven, (which Mr. *Biddle* taketh as equipollent terms from Math. 2. 11.) nor by the curious neyther, without some palpable affectation of novelty and singularity.

But the Antecedent is very true : *ergo*, the Consequent. The Assumption is clear from Heb. 1. 3. where the Greek Idiom is very observable; when he had purged our sins, by himselfe, Heb. 9. 26. Col. 1. 20. 1. Cor. 5. 7. Ephes. 5. 2. or the offering himselfe, hee did or hath sat down at the right hand Sec. And how can hee offer himselfe so, but by the yeelding of his body, and the powring out of his blood, Tit. 2. 14. Heb. 10. 10. Matth. 26. 28. Heb. 9. 14.

And therefore is the spirit so exact in expression, to wit, that he might reconcile unto himselfe, having made peace, through the blood of his Cross; *ὑπὸ* through him, referring all unto his person, as also Ephes. 2. 13. 14. 15. 16. To say nothing of the most punctuall correspondency between the Greek *ἱλασμός*, so emphatically used, Heb. 2. 17. to answer the Hebrew *Caphar*, so often used in the old Testament, for purging or expiating, to shew the perfect accomplishment of typicall sacrifices in that true blood of the

Cove-

Covenant, so sprinkled or powred out, from such a person, as is called our Pasſeover, 1. Cor. 5. 7. Nor ſhould Mr. Biddle ſlight, but reverently examine whatſoever ſuch have well ſayd according to the word, as we have reaſon to ſtile all Doctors of Divine myſteries, and graciouſly inſtruted in the main; for notwithstanding any accidental error, yet none of us can without higheſt impudence, thinke our ſelves comparable to them in vertue or piety, knowledge or judgement, wiſdome or ſufficiency. I wiſh therefore he would peruſe and ſeriously ponder, how *Auſten* expreſſeth him ſelte upon thoſe ſoure things conſiderable in every ſacrifice. 1. To whom. 2. For whom. 3. By whom. 4. What. *Lib. de Trinit. 4. cap. 14.* So, I think, hee might ſee enough for his ſatisfaction, and without any ſhame receive it from ſuch an Authour.

Argument 6. From Heb. 13. 20.

VVhatſoever is bloud of the Covenant powred out and ſprinkled, the ſame is ſacrificed bloud, or bloud of the ſacrifice, ſhed for obtaining the end of the Covenant, that is to ſay, remiſſion of ſins, as appeareth by Levit. 7. 2. cap. 5. 9. cap. 9. 9. cap. 8. 15. compared with Hebr. 9. 19. 20, 22.

Assumpt. But the bloud of Jeſus Chriſt ſprinkled or powred out upon the Croſſe; is the bloud of the everlaſting Covenant, ſhed for the remiſſion of ſins and iniquities, never to be remembred any more, as appeareth plainly from theſe texts, Heb. 13. 20. Matth. 26. 28. Heb. 8. 6, 12. *Ergo*, the bloud of Chriſt (ſo ſprinkled and powred out) was ſacrificed bloud or bloud of the ſacrifice.

This Argument was slightly offered Feb. 25. 1654. in way of refelling Mr. *Biddles* fancied evasion, from Argument 2. and especially that which is Argument 5. by saying that it cleansed and reconciled, not as a sacrifice, but as the blood of the Covenant, &c. which seemeth a cold distinction without a difference. But let him answer distinctly upon deliberation, and if hee doe not acknowledge this Argument as Apodeicticall, I doubt not but to make it evident, that he is grossly ignorant of the New Testament, according to the true nature and tenour of it, which rightly understood, must needs destroy or subdue those hereticall novelties, which exalt themselves against the truths of Jesus.

Argument 7. Gal. 2. ult.

Either the blood of Christ (so sprinkled and powred out) was a proper sacrifice, necessarily required for due satisfaction to divine Justice, or God the Father is to be accused of monstrous cruelty, in so giving up his son, Ioh. 3, 15. and the son himselfe of temerity, in that he would bee made a curse, Gal. 3, 13. and exposed to reproach and punishment, without a cause, Gal. 2. 21, by that shamefull death of the Crosse, Philip. 2, 6, 7, 8.

Assumption. But God the Father is not to be so accused &c. nor the son neither, nor can bee without highest Blasphemy.

Ergo, the blood of Christ, so sprinkled and powred was a proper sacrifice, necessarily required for due satisfaction to divine justice, and to make good his truth; which is the reason why he hath been made the servant of circumcision.

Rom.

Rom. 15. 8, submitting himselfe by our nature, assumed unto circumcision, that so under the Law he might answer the Law for us, and by death destroy him who had the power of death: all which evidently appears from these texts, Gen. 2, 17, Rom. 6, 23. with Rom. 8, 32, 33, 34, and Gen. 3, 15, with Heb. 2, 14. 15, for as *Zalucum* lawgiver to the Locrians, after that he had made adultery punishable by losse of both the eyes, although as an absolute Prince he might have pardoned his son, though convict of the sin, & so have dispensed with the Law in his perticular, yet as a just Prince, or as such as hee desired to be reputed, hee could nether pardon nor dispence.

So though I repute it full of irreverence and prophane presumption, to dispute what is within Gods absolute power, what not, or any way to limit that by the Law or rule of our speech or reason. Yet, *Salva dei Justitia & veritate*, saving his justice and truth, hee could not pardone our sins without punishing them, nor abollish the curse, without undoing it, nor destroy the death without enduring it, neither could he so have conquered sin, curse, and death, as to swallow them up to absolute victory, if he were any other kind of person, then wee confesse him, nay now and believe him to be.

Now to prove the disjunctiō necessary, take but notice of the opposition of those two parts in the Proposition, and then you will apprehend, viz. that if the truth and justice of God had not required such a sacrifice as necessary, it had been both cruelty and more then Stoicall temerity, or rashnesse, to make a person of that dignity, innocency, and meritorious eminency, so to suffer the extreamest of all reproach and punishment, Mr. *Biddle* seemed rather to

flight or decline rather than answer any thing to this Argument, so opposed, saying no more then what I have heard some moderne Jewes assert upon such like occasion; But if upon second thoughts he can aver any thing, to avoide the force of it, and not in so doing, abandon the very basis of the common faith and christianity, it shall be presently examined and acknowledged.

Mr. Biddle:

THough I have reason to understand you better than some of your Adversaries, having so lately been an ear witness of your Assertions, yet by a more naked Discovery, I can better evince the enormity of your new conceits : If you therefore abound in that candor and ingenuity which you accused me to want, then let your deliberate Answer be distinct and punctually directed to what pinchereth ; never stand upon strictest terms at the contest, when you and our Auditors would tie me to prove by expresse text, viz. the blood of Christ to be, not only a proper, (or the chiefe) but the only sacrifice, for so we may lose the principall, and stray it in the throng of Incidents, which I earnestly desire to avoyd. Whatsoever I have sayd for your better satisfaction, according to the sence of that sacred Doctor (*August. contra advers. Leg. & Prophet.*) viz. *quoniam singulari, & solo viro sacrificio Christi (augustinus pro nobis effusus est :* which I durst not there alludge, lest there both he and I should be disdayned, but did rather assert the error of your assumed Principle from our Saviours answer to the Sadducees, and that testamentary instance of Matth. 26. 26. ταῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα, and the ponderation of words used by the Apost Gal. 3. arguing a maine principle not evidently appearing in the text : nor say nothing how they were written for our search, and that Aristotle saith enough to make that absurdity evident : ὅταν δὲ οὗτος περὶ ἀλλήλα, ὡς σαφὴς ᾖ, καὶ εἰς ἀδύνατον ἀντιλογεῖται, τότε μὴ ὄντων αὐτῷ ἐν σαφείᾳ ἐσθαι.

all is good and beautiful. Mr. Wick, I needn't say to

FINIS.

